

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-33 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 5, 18, 20, and 21 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in at least paragraph [00109] of the present Specification.

Claim 4 has been cancelled.

Terminal Disclaimer

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,287,041. While Applicants do not wish to file a terminal disclaimer at this time, Applicants will file a terminal disclaimer if needed in the future.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 and 4-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jost et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,778,651 ("Jost") in view of Thornberg et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,742,588 ("Thornberg"). While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in the continuing application, to establish that the cited references, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

Applicants assert that Claims 1-2 and 4-33 are patentable over Jost and Thornberg, taken alone or in any permissible combination, because the cited references, taken alone or in any permissible combination, fail to disclose the limitations of independent Claims 1, 18, and 20. For example, regarding amended Claim 1, and similarly, amended Claims 18 and 20, nothing in Jost and Thornberg, taken alone or in any permissible combination, discloses (or renders obvious) “the second intermediate form comprises a list of service request elements with a hierarchy of data components, wherein the hierarchy of data components comprises a service request common ID component,” as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 18, and 20. Page 7 of the Office Action cites col. 31, lines 49-52 of Jost as allegedly disclosing the recited element (the claimed “service request common ID component”). Col. 31, lines 49-52 of Jost discusses “USOC_ID_NUM – Defines a number which uniquely identifies a USOC_ID (used as the primary key). This number is used in accessing the USOC_COMBO_REF table.” According to col. 3, line 28 of Jost, “USOC” stands for “Uniform Service Order Code.” Thus, for example, referring to Fig. 58 of Jost (USOC descriptions window), the USOCs refer to specific services (e.g., POSITIVE ID, CALLER INTELLIDATA, INTELLINUMBER, DISASTER ROUTING SVC, and the like) that can be provided to a customer, not, as claimed, “a service request common ID component,” where the service request information comprises “a report of a loss of a service from a customer.” Thus, since Jost’s USOCs refer to actual services and not a “report of a loss of a service from a customer,” as recited in the independent claims, amended independent Claims 1, 18, and 20, and all dependent claims are patentable over Jost and Thornberg, taken alone or in any permissible combination. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starkovich et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,111,077 (“Starkovich”) in view of Thornberg. While not

conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in the continuing application, to establish that the cited references, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed. Nothing in the cited passages of Starkovich and Thornberg discloses (or renders obvious) “the second intermediate form comprises a list of service request elements with a hierarchy of data components, wherein the hierarchy of data components comprises a service request common ID component,” as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 18. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jost in view of Starkovich and further in view of Thornberg and in even further view of official notice. While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in the continuing application, to establish that the cited references, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed. However, the Office Action’s taking of official notice does not affect the patentability of independent Claim 1. Thus, dependent Claim 3 is patentable by virtue of its dependency on independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric A. Stephenson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,321
Telephone: (512) 439-5093
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099